

REMARKS

In summary, 62 claims numbered 1-20, 23-35, and 37-65 are pending. Claims 1, 12, 26, 40, 46, and 60 are independent. Claims 1, 7, and 12 are hereby amended without adding new matter. The Office Action withdrew previous rejections and their finality, but asserts new grounds of rejection. Claims 1-7, 9-11, 40, 41, 43-45, 60, 61 and 63-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Claims 8, 12-20, 23-35, 37-39, 42, 46-59, and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections. Reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

References to the pending application are to the published version of it, i.e., Published Application Publication No. 2005/0071243. Although believed to be unnecessary to overcome the cited references, some amendments were made to clarify claim language or to add additional patentable distinctions over the cited references. Support for indirect communications permitting debugging of a process without prior knowledge where it is running may be found, for example, in paragraphs 70-73 and FIG. 4. Support for using historical or tracked events in a symbolic representation of a process to permit post mortem analysis including recreation of the lifespan and interaction of an instance may be found, for example, in paragraphs 08, 09, 12, 23, 64, 67-69, 76, 77, 95 and 102.

Telephone Conversation With Examiner

Examiner Wang is thanked for the telephone conversation conducted on March 25, 2009. Proposed claim amendments were discussed. Cited art was discussed. It appears that the proposed claim amendments overcome the rejections based on the cited art.

Rejection of Claims 1-7, 9-11, 40, 41, 43-45, 60, 61 and 63-65 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-7, 9-11, 40, 41, 43-45, 60, 61 and 63-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0168155, by O'Farrell *et al.*

(hereinafter referred to as “O’Farrell”). (Office Action, pp. 2-10). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

It is respectfully submitted that the claimed subject matter is allowable over O’Farrell because patentable distinctions were overlooked, O’Farrell does not teach what it is alleged to teach and additional patentable distinctions are made by present amendments.

First, O’Farrell does not teach or suggest multiple communication methods between the debugger and remote computer running a business process, let alone the two methods in claim 1. Indirect communication, illustrated in one embodiment in FIG. 4 communication path through message box 425, permits debugging process 445 to begin debugging process 405 without knowing machine 400 is running it. Subsequently, a direct communication channel is established between debugging process 445 and business process 420 running on machine 400. Direct communication channels are discussed, for example, in paragraphs 0024, 0064, 0072 and 0075 of the Published Application. O’Farrell discloses neither the indirect communication nor direct channel communication in the claims.

In contrast, as illustrated in O’Farrell’s FIG. 9 and discussed in paragraph 0083, O’Farrell requires knowledge of the host computer running a process. As shown in O’Farrell’s FIG. 6 and paragraphs 36, 42, 44, 68, 83 and 88, O’Farrell’s flow debugger 64 and debug managers 60 only communicate by passing messages back and forth through communication layer 62. Thus, O’Farrell fails to teach or suggest the claimed indirect and direct channel communications.

Second, O’Farrell does not teach or suggest collecting, reading, or using historical information. It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action misconstrues passages in O’Farrell.

The first misinterpretation is with regard to hooks, which, for example, the Office Action cites in paragraph 0045 against claim 1. Hooks are used to start and end debug sessions by transferring control between run-time code and a debug manager process. O’Farrell, ¶¶ 0066, 0079. Hooks are discussed in paragraphs 0042-0046 and FIG. 7 of O’Farrell. Hooks are written into

runtime code. Hooks check if a debug flag has been set or unset by flow debugger 64. If set, the hook calls the separate debug manager process, which then communicates with flow debugger 64. Thus, paragraphs 0045 and 0055 (cited by the Office Action), which merely mention common placement of hooks in run-time code, do not in any way teach or suggest collecting, reading or using historical “stored state information regarding events.”

The second misinterpretation is with regard to tokens, which, for example, the Office Action cites in paragraph 0033 and 0034 against claims 40 and 60. Tokens are not “tracking information about execution of the business process service.” Instead, as explained in paragraphs 0032-0034 and 0087, of O’Farrell, tokens are a representation of the process itself. The claim language refers to tracking information during execution of the process. Thus, the Office Action’s citation to paragraphs 0033 and 0034 are in error.

Third, even if O’Farrell did collect and read historical stored state information, it does not use it to generate and display a symbolic representation of the operation of the business process. The claimed subject matter bases a symbolic representation on historical stored state information, permitting for example post mortem analysis including recreation of the lifespan and interaction of an instance that failed.

In contrast, O’Farrell only creates its graphical depiction of flow from original design information in tokens; not historical operation data. O’Farrell, ¶¶ 32-34, 87. O’Farrell’s paragraph 0043 (cited in the Office Action) merely states that flow debugger 64 receives debug data for presentation on GUI. This doesn’t say what the data is or what window in FIGS. 9-17 it is presented in (a textual window or otherwise). This falls far short of teaching or suggesting that flow debugger 64 receives historical stored state information (in addition to current debugging data) and uses the historical stored state information to construct a graphical depiction of a flow. O’Farrell clearly fails to teach or suggest the claimed subject matter.

The foregoing remarks apply in whole or in part to each pending claim. For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 1-7, 9-11, 40, 41, 43-45,

60, 61 and 63-65 is inaccurate. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Rejection of Claims 8, 12-20, 23-35, 37-39, 42, 46-59 and 62 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 8, 12-20, 23-35, 37-39, 42, 46-59 and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Farrell in view of "BizTalk Unleashed," 1st ed., Feb. 2002, authored by Adams *et al.* (hereinafter referred to as "Adams"). (Office Action, pp. 11-26). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The foregoing remarks, in whole or in part, apply equally well to the rejection of claims 8, 12-20, 23-35, 37-39, 42, 46-59 and 62. The Office Action makes the same citations and arguments relative to O'Farrell made against claims 1-7, 9-11, 40, 41, 43-45, 60, 61 and 63-65.

The Office Action does not cite Adams to make up for O'Farrell's lack of disclosure detailed above. The Office Action cites Adams with regard to Microsoft BizTalk's interceptor. The pending application points out that it leverages the benefits of existing interceptor tools. However, the existence of interceptor tools, including in Adams, does not teach or suggest the claimed use of interceptor tools relative to debugging. Ignore the word interceptor. The debugging function of causing a server to enter or leave a debugging state if a break point is found in monitored runtime data is not taught or suggested by Adams.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 8, 12-20, 23-35, 37-39, 42, 46-59 and 62 is inaccurate. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Amendments made herein as well as amendments previously made are without abandonment of subject matter. Applicant expressly reserves the right to, in the pending application or any application related thereto, reintroduce any subject matter removed from the

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-2763/305222.1
Application No.: 10/676,743
Office Action Dated: January 16, 2009

PATENT

scope of claims by any amendment and introduce any subject matter not present in current or previous claims.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-2763/305222.1
Application No.: 10/676,743
Office Action Dated: January 16, 2009

PATENT

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of this application and an early Notice of Allowance are requested. Applicants desire to hold a telephone interview with the Examiner and his supervisor following their review of this reply.

Date: April 16, 2009

/Joseph F. Oriti/
Joseph F. Oriti
Registration No. 47,835

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439